

When Machines Learn to Write, What Is Left for the Human Mind?

Dr. B. S. Chakravarthy

The pen gave us a voice. The printing press gave that voice an audience. Artificial intelligence may give it unprecedented reach. But who decides what is worth saying?

There is something deeply human about watching the world change and wondering whether something precious is being lost.

An elderly writer sits at his desk. For forty years, he has written with patience. Every sentence has cost him something. A little time. A little memory. Sometimes a sleepless night.

He remembers searching for the right word. Crossing out a paragraph. Beginning again. He remembers the satisfaction of finding a sentence that finally expressed what he had been trying to say.

Now a young man sits beside him, opens a computer, types a few instructions, and produces an essay in less than a minute.

The old writer is disturbed.

Where is the struggle? Where is the experience? Where is the soul?

If a machine can produce poetry, fiction and philosophy without having lived a single human day, what happens to literature?

It is a reasonable question.

Recently, a Telugu writer from Anantapur in southern India, Sri Gudipudi Suryam, expressed a similar concern. He compared AI-generated writing to an artificial sweetener. It may taste sweet, but it is not the sweetness of nature. He worried that commercial interests would increasingly replace genuine literary effort, and that the human touch might disappear beneath a flood of machine-generated words.

I respect that concern.

It comes from someone who values writing not merely as a product, but as an experience.

Yet I find myself looking at the same technological revolution from another direction.

Perhaps the real question is not whether a machine can write.

Perhaps it is whether writing was ever the final purpose of human thought.

And if machines can now help us express our thoughts, why should that necessarily diminish our humanity?

The bullock cart and the aeroplane

Imagine a man who has travelled all his life in a bullock cart.

He knows the rhythm of the wheels. He knows the smell of the earth after rain. He recognises villages by the trees beside the road. He knows where to stop for water and where the afternoon shade falls.

Then someone offers him a seat on an aeroplane.

He refuses.

"The journey will lose its beauty," he says.

He is not entirely wrong.

Something will be lost.

But something extraordinary will also be gained.

A journey that once took several days can now be completed in an hour. The time saved can be spent with family, learning something new, helping another person, or simply enjoying life.

Should we reject the aeroplane because it cannot reproduce the poetry of the bullock cart?

Of course not.

We can admire the old journey without insisting that everyone continue travelling the old way.

Human civilisation has always advanced by transferring effort from our bodies and minds into tools.

The wheel reduced the burden on our legs. The plough multiplied the strength of our hands. The telescope extended our sight. The microscope opened an invisible world. The printing press carried human thought beyond the lifetime of its author.

The calculator spared us repetitive arithmetic. Computers relieved us of enormous amounts of clerical and analytical work.

None of these inventions made human beings less human.

But artificial intelligence is different in one important respect.

It is entering a territory we once believed belonged almost exclusively to us.

Language. Imagination. Reasoning. Creativity.

That is why the arrival of AI feels more unsettling than the arrival of a faster vehicle.

We are not merely replacing physical labour.

We are beginning to share parts of our intellectual labour with machines.

And that forces us to ask a more uncomfortable question.

If a machine can perform something we considered uniquely human, was the activity itself what made us human?

The difference between producing words and having something to say

Let us imagine two books.

The first is written by a mother who has lost her child. She struggles to find words. Her sentences are simple. Some are incomplete. She does not care about literary elegance.

But every sentence carries the weight of an experience she cannot forget.

The second book is generated by an AI system trained on millions of examples of human writing. Its language is beautiful. Its metaphors are moving. Its grammar is perfect.

Which book is more valuable?

My answer is that we cannot decide merely by looking at how the words were produced.

The mother's book has something the machine does not possess: a lived human history behind its account.

But now consider a third possibility.

The mother has never written a book. She does not know how to organise her memories. She cannot find the language to express what she feels.

She speaks to an AI system.

It helps her arrange her thoughts. It suggests words. She rejects some, changes others, and gradually discovers a way to tell her story.

The result moves thousands of readers.

Has technology stolen her humanity?

Or has it helped her express something that might otherwise have remained silent?

This distinction matters.

We often confuse the difficulty of producing something with the value of what is produced.

A person may spend ten years writing a poor book. Another may write a remarkable essay in a single afternoon.

Time and effort deserve respect. But they are not reliable measures of truth, beauty or usefulness.

A surgeon who completes a difficult operation in one hour is not inferior to a surgeon who takes five.

A scientist who uses a computer to analyse data is not less scientific than someone who performs every calculation by hand.

We do not admire unnecessary difficulty for its own sake.

Why should writing be different?

Yet there is a boundary.

If a person asks AI to invent an experience and then presents that experience as personal testimony, something important has been violated.

Not because a machine helped.

Because the author was dishonest.

The problem is not artificial language. It is artificial authenticity.

What a hospital taught me about knowledge

I have spent much of my professional life working with sick children.

A hospital is an unusual place to understand the relationship between knowledge, technology and humanity.

Consider a newborn struggling to breathe.

A modern neonatal intensive care unit may have sophisticated ventilators, monitors, infusion pumps, imaging systems and laboratory facilities.

These machines can measure what human senses cannot reliably detect. They can deliver treatments with extraordinary precision.

But imagine a doctor who looks only at the monitor and never examines the child.

Or one who accepts every machine-generated reading without questioning whether it makes clinical sense.

We would call that poor medicine.

The machine is useful because the doctor understands what it measures, what it cannot measure, and what must be done when the information is uncertain.

Now imagine the opposite.

A doctor refuses to use modern equipment because medicine should retain its traditional human touch.

That would be equally unreasonable.

Human compassion and technological competence are not enemies.

A ventilator does not make the doctor less caring.

An ultrasound machine does not make clinical judgment unnecessary.

And an AI system does not automatically make a writer less thoughtful.

But there is another lesson from medicine.

The consequences of a wrong decision are real.

A beautifully written clinical recommendation can still be dangerously incorrect. A confident answer can conceal missing evidence. A sophisticated algorithm can overlook a detail that changes everything.

The responsibility remains with the professional who acts.

Writing may not always carry the immediate consequences of medicine. Yet words can influence beliefs, shape public opinion, damage reputations and sometimes change lives.

That is why I believe authorship must mean more than putting one's name beneath a paragraph.

To be an author is to accept responsibility for what one chooses to tell the world.

The same principle should guide a physician, scientist, journalist, teacher, policymaker or novelist.

The artificial sweetener argument

Let us return to the comparison between AI writing and artificial sweeteners.

It is a clever metaphor because it captures something many people instinctively feel.

Natural sweetness seems authentic. Artificial sweetness seems manufactured.

But metaphors, however beautiful, can sometimes mislead us.

Imagine two cups of tea.

One is prepared by a grandmother who has been making tea for fifty years. She knows exactly how much ginger to add, how long to boil the milk, and when to remove the pot from the fire.

The second is prepared by an automated machine.

They may taste identical.

Yet drinking tea with one's grandmother involves much more than taste.

It involves memory, affection, conversation and presence.

The machine can reproduce the beverage. It cannot reproduce the entire relationship.

But suppose the grandmother is elderly and finds it difficult to stand for long periods. The machine prepares the tea while she sits beside her grandchild and tells stories.

Has the machine destroyed the experience?

No.

It has removed a burden while preserving what matters most.

This is how I would like to understand AI-assisted creativity.

There are situations where the process itself is meaningful.

A handwritten letter from someone we love may be precious precisely because it was written by that person. A poem composed during grief may matter because of the struggle involved in finding its words.

There are other situations where the primary value lies in communicating an idea clearly.

A teacher preparing learning material, a researcher explaining a discovery, or a doctor writing about public health may benefit enormously from assistance.

We should not impose one standard on every kind of writing.

The handwoven shawl and the factory-made sweater can both keep us warm. Yet we may value them differently.

The mistake would be to sell the factory-made sweater as handwoven.

Transparency allows people to make their own choices.

A new kind of literacy

When I was young, literacy meant being able to read and write.

Later, computer literacy became important.

Today, another form of literacy is emerging.

It is not simply the ability to type instructions into an AI system.

Almost anyone can do that.

The deeper skill is knowing what to ask, how to examine the answer, where to look for evidence, and when to reject the result.

A weak question may produce a polished but shallow answer.

A thoughtful question can open an entirely new direction of inquiry.

Consider a student studying climate change.

He asks AI to write an essay. It produces a thousand words. He submits them without reading.

He has completed an assignment.

But has he learned anything?

Now consider another student.

She asks why atmospheric carbon dioxide absorbs infrared radiation. She asks how scientists measure global temperatures. She challenges the evidence, compares explanations, studies uncertainty and finally writes her own conclusions.

Both students used AI.

Only one used it to develop understanding.

The difference lies not in the technology, but in the intellectual relationship with it.

This is especially important for education.

A child who uses a calculator before understanding arithmetic may lose an opportunity to develop numerical intuition.

But a child who already understands arithmetic can use the calculator to explore much more advanced problems.

Similarly, AI can become either a shortcut around thinking or an instrument for deeper thinking.

UNESCO's guidance on generative AI in education emphasises protecting human agency and ensuring that these technologies support, rather than undermine, the development of human capabilities.

I would put it more simply.

Before we teach children how to use AI, we must teach them how to disagree with it.

That may become one of the most important educational responsibilities of our generation.

When everyone can write, who will be heard?

There is another side to this revolution.

For centuries, the ability to publish ideas was restricted.

A person needed education, language skills, access to publishers, money, or the approval of influential institutions.

Many valuable experiences remained undocumented.

Think of a farmer who has spent forty years observing changes in rainfall, soil and crops.

Think of a nurse who has worked in a rural hospital for three decades.

Think of a grandmother who knows hundreds of traditional stories but has never written a page.

Think of a disabled person whose physical limitations make conventional writing difficult.

These people may possess extraordinary knowledge.

Yet they may lack the means to express it in a form that others can easily understand.

AI could change that.

The farmer could describe his observations in his own language and develop a practical guide for younger farmers.

The nurse could organise decades of experience into educational material.

The grandmother could preserve stories for future generations.

A person who cannot type easily could dictate ideas and refine them through conversation.

For such people, AI is not merely a convenience.

It may be an instrument of intellectual freedom.

A voice that was once confined to a village could reach another continent.

A language with limited publishing resources could gain new opportunities for translation and communication.

Of course, access will not be equal. Digital infrastructure, affordability, language representation and education will continue to matter.

And systems trained predominantly on powerful languages and cultures may reproduce their biases.

Nevertheless, the possibility is remarkable.

The printing press made books more available. AI may make authorship more available.

That is not a small change.

It is a potential redistribution of expressive power.

The uncomfortable economics of creativity

We must not become so enthusiastic about technology that we ignore the people whose livelihoods it may disrupt.

A professional translator may lose assignments.

A journalist may find that routine reports are increasingly automated.

A commercial illustrator may struggle to compete with systems that generate images in seconds.

A young writer who once earned a modest income producing articles may discover that clients now expect the same work at a fraction of the cost.

These are not imaginary concerns.

And telling such people simply to adapt would be insensitive.

Every technological revolution creates benefits, but those benefits are rarely distributed equally.

The printing press expanded access to knowledge, but it also transformed the livelihoods of scribes.

Industrial machinery increased production while disrupting traditional crafts.

Digital photography made images abundant while changing the economics of professional photography.

AI may follow a similar pattern, although its breadth and speed could make the transition particularly difficult.

There is also a serious question of fairness.

If AI systems learn from enormous collections of human-created books, articles, paintings and music, what obligations do their developers have towards the people whose work contributed to those systems?

The answer is neither simple nor settled.

Copyright, consent, compensation, attribution and competition all deserve serious public discussion.

There is another danger.

A handful of corporations may control the infrastructure through which enormous amounts of information and creative work are produced.

That concentration of power matters.

A world where everyone can generate content is not necessarily a world where everyone has an equal opportunity to be heard.

Algorithms may decide which voices become visible.

Commercial interests may reward outrage over reflection, speed over accuracy, and popularity over substance.

A thousand thoughtful essays may disappear beneath a million cheaply generated distractions.

This is where editors, publishers, educators and readers become more important, not less.

When producing words becomes easy, deciding which words deserve attention becomes difficult.

Abundance does not automatically create **wisdom**. **Sometimes it creates noise.**

The danger of beautiful nonsense

One of the most extraordinary qualities of modern AI is its ability to produce convincing language.

It can explain a complex scientific idea in simple terms. It can imitate literary styles. It can organise arguments, suggest analogies and construct narratives.

But fluency is not the same as truth.

A statement does not become correct because it is beautifully expressed.

A fictional reference does not become real because it resembles an academic citation.

A flawed argument does not become sound because its sentences are elegant.

This is a particularly serious challenge for people who are unfamiliar with a subject.

The less we know, the harder it becomes to recognise a convincing error.

Imagine someone asking AI to explain a rare disease.

The answer may sound authoritative. It may include medical terminology, plausible mechanisms and treatment suggestions.

But without adequate knowledge, the reader may not notice an important omission or an incorrect recommendation.

The same problem applies to history, law, economics and public policy.

This is why minimum competence matters.

If we use a powerful tool, we should possess enough understanding to evaluate its output—or know when to seek someone who does.

Otherwise, we are not extending our intelligence.

We are surrendering our judgment.

The distinction is crucial.

I am not concerned that AI can answer questions.

I am concerned about a society that gradually loses the habit of asking whether those answers are correct.

Creativity was never an isolated miracle

There is a romantic image of the writer sitting alone, creating something entirely original from the depths of personal genius.

It is a beautiful image.

But is it entirely accurate?

Every writer inherits a language.

Every poet inherits rhythms, metaphors and traditions.

Every philosopher responds, consciously or unconsciously, to ideas that came before.

Shakespeare drew upon earlier stories and historical material. Scientific discoveries emerge from generations of accumulated knowledge. Musicians learn scales and traditions before developing their own compositions.

Human creativity has always involved absorbing, transforming and recombining what already exists.

This does not mean that creativity is merely recombination.

Human beings also bring intentions, emotions, bodies, relationships, memories and lived consequences to their work.

But it does challenge the notion that a creative work must emerge from complete isolation to be authentic.

The philosophy of creativity has long examined whether originality, value, intention and process are all necessary for something to count as creative. AI has made these questions more urgent, but it did not invent them.

Consider a musician.

She learns from hundreds of compositions, practises for years, absorbs influences and finally creates something that feels unmistakably her own.

Now imagine she uses AI to explore unfamiliar harmonies.

Does the presence of AI automatically invalidate her composition?

I do not think so.

But if she merely presses a button, accepts the first result and claims to have personally composed every note, our judgment may reasonably change.

The difference is not simply whether AI was used.

It is what the human contributed.

The same principle applies to writing.

Creativity is not only the production of novelty. It is the meaningful selection and transformation of possibilities.

And meaning, in human life, is closely connected to experience, purpose and responsibility.

The extraordinary value of a limited lifetime

There is one argument for using AI that I find especially compelling.

We are temporary beings.

We know that our time is limited.

Yet our curiosity is almost unlimited.

There are more books than we can read, more questions than we can answer, more places than we can visit, and more ideas than we can explore during a single lifetime.

Every hour has a cost.

Not necessarily a financial cost.

A human cost.

An hour spent on repetitive formatting is an hour unavailable for reading, reflection, family, teaching or discovery.

This does not mean every moment must be productive.

Rest, conversation, wandering and even doing nothing can be valuable.

But unnecessary labour should not be mistaken for virtue.

Suppose a researcher spends three months manually organising material that a computer could help organise in three days.

What has been gained by refusing the tool?

Perhaps nothing.

The saved time could be used to examine the evidence more carefully, question assumptions, design better experiments or mentor younger colleagues.

Similarly, a writer who spends less time correcting grammar may spend more time thinking about what is worth writing.

This is the promise of AI at its best.

Not that it will eliminate effort.

But that it may allow us to move effort towards more meaningful questions.

I have experienced a small version of this myself.

Without formal training in computer programming, I have been able to explore the development of digital tools, educational material, articles and books with AI assistance.

The speed is astonishing.

But the most interesting part is not the speed.

It is the conversation.

I begin with a question.

The system offers an answer.

I examine it, disagree with parts of it, add experience, change the direction and ask again.

Sometimes the result is useful.

Sometimes it is superficial.

Sometimes it is wrong.

And occasionally, the exchange reveals a possibility I had not previously considered.

The technology does not eliminate my responsibility to understand the result.

It makes that responsibility more important.

AI can shorten the distance between an idea and its expression. It cannot guarantee that the idea deserves to be expressed.

That remains our task.

The author as a gardener

Perhaps we need a new metaphor for authorship.

For centuries, we imagined the writer as a craftsman.

Someone who shaped every sentence by hand.

That image remains valuable.

But AI introduces another possibility.

The writer as a gardener.

A gardener does not manufacture every leaf.

He does not personally construct the chemistry of photosynthesis.

He cannot command a seed to grow.

Yet the garden reflects his choices.

He selects the plants, prepares the soil, provides water, removes weeds and decides what belongs.

He recognises when something is flourishing and when something must be cut back.

A neglected garden becomes wild and chaotic.

An excessively controlled garden may lose its natural beauty.

A good gardener understands both intervention and restraint.

Perhaps AI-assisted writing can work in a similar way.

The machine may generate possibilities.

The human selects, questions, shapes and sometimes rejects them.

But there is an important qualification.

A gardener should not claim to have created the seed itself.

And an author should not conceal the contribution of a tool when that contribution is substantial and relevant.

Honesty does not diminish creativity.

It gives creativity credibility.

What should the world's leaders do?

The future of AI cannot be left entirely to technology companies.

Nor can it be decided by governments acting only out of fear.

Political leaders, university heads, publishers, scientists, teachers and civil society must recognise that this is not merely a technological transition.

It is a transition in how knowledge is produced, trusted and distributed.

The central question should not be how quickly AI can replace human work.

It should be how effectively AI can expand human capability without weakening human freedom.

Education systems must preserve independent reasoning.

Publishers must develop credible standards for transparency and attribution.

Governments must protect people against deception, exploitation and unfair concentration of power.

Researchers must examine how AI changes learning, creativity and decision-making over time.

Technology developers must take responsibility for the systems they release, including their limitations and foreseeable harms.

And ordinary citizens must retain the right and the ability to question technological authority.

This is not an argument for slowing every innovation.

It is an argument for giving innovation a human purpose.

The most advanced society will not necessarily be the one with the largest number of AI systems.

It may be the one whose citizens can use those systems without losing their independence of mind.

The question that matters most

Let us return to the elderly writer sitting at his desk.

He watches the young man produce an essay in seconds.

He remembers the decades he spent learning his craft.

He wonders whether all that effort has suddenly become unnecessary.

I would like to tell him something.

Your experience has not become worthless.

Your knowledge of language has not become irrelevant.

Your understanding of human nature has not disappeared.

If anything, the world may need your judgment more than before.

Because when everyone can produce a thousand words in a minute, we need people who can recognise the one sentence worth remembering.

When machines can generate endless stories, we need readers who can distinguish emotional manipulation from genuine insight.

When information becomes abundant, we need people who understand the difference between knowing something and merely repeating it.

And when technology becomes powerful, we need individuals who are willing to ask uncomfortable questions.

The old writer and the young AI user need not be enemies.

One brings experience.

The other brings new possibilities.

Both can learn from each other.

The real tragedy would be if the older generation rejected every new tool while the younger generation abandoned every old lesson.

Civilisation advances when knowledge is inherited, examined and transformed.

Not when one generation simply replaces another.

Epilogue: The freedom to remain human

We are living through an extraordinary moment.

For the first time, machines can participate in activities that were once considered intimate expressions of human intelligence.

They can write stories, generate images, compose music, explain scientific theories and assist in solving complex problems.

Their capabilities will almost certainly continue to change.

Some human skills may become less economically valuable. Others may become more important. New forms of creativity may emerge, while familiar professions face difficult transitions.

We should neither romanticise the past nor blindly worship the future.

There is wisdom in preserving what matters.

There is also wisdom in letting go of what no longer needs to burden us.

A handwritten letter may remain precious.

A machine-assisted essay may also be meaningful.

A poem written entirely by a human may carry a special history.

An AI-assisted book may allow a person who never had the opportunity to write to finally share a lifetime of experience.

These possibilities need not cancel one another.

But we must protect something fundamental.

The freedom to think.

The freedom to question.

The freedom to reject an answer, however confidently it is presented.

The freedom to choose our values and accept responsibility for our actions.

I do not believe humanity's greatest achievement is the ability to arrange words into beautiful sentences.

It is something deeper.

Matter, shaped by billions of years of cosmic evolution, has become capable of reflecting upon its own existence.

We are temporary arrangements of atoms, living for a brief moment in an immense universe.

Yet we can wonder.

We can care.

We can recognise suffering and try to reduce it.

We can imagine a future that does not yet exist and work towards making it real.

We can ask whether what we are doing is right.

And we can change our minds.

That capacity is precious.

Artificial intelligence may help us explore it more fully. It may also tempt us to neglect it.

The choice is not entirely ours, because technologies and institutions shape the choices available to us. But our responsibility to question and influence their direction remains.

So I do not wish to return to the bullock cart merely because the aeroplane has changed the journey.

Nor do I wish to board an aeroplane without knowing where it is going.

I want to understand the destination.

I want to examine the route.

And I want to retain the freedom to say no.

Perhaps that is what it means to remain human in the age of artificial intelligence.

Not to insist that every word must come from our own hands.

Not to compete with machines in speed.

Not to measure our worth by tasks that technology can perform.

But to remain conscious of what we seek, why we seek it, and what consequences follow from our choices.

AI may write the sentence.

But we must decide whether it is true.

AI may offer a thousand possibilities.

But we must decide which one is worth pursuing.

AI may help us tell our stories.

But we must still live the lives that make those stories meaningful.

The pen was never the source of our humanity.

Neither is the keyboard.

And neither will be artificial intelligence.

The source lies in our capacity to question, to understand, to care, and to act with responsibility in an uncertain world.

That is our freedom.

And perhaps, ultimately, our peace.

Dr. B. S. Chakravarthy Professor and Head, Department of Pediatrics Andhra Medical College & King George Hospital, Visakhapatnam, India

8 October 2026

Author's note: This essay was inspired by the concerns expressed by Telugu writer Sri Gudipudi Suryam of Anantapur, India, about the future of literature in the age of artificial intelligence. I am grateful for the questions he raised. The essay was developed through human-directed discussion and AI-assisted drafting. Its perspective and final responsibility rest with the author.